



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,787	09/28/2001	Tomoaki Endoh	35.C15845	3430

5514 7590 06/02/2006

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

DULANEY, BENJAMIN O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/964,787

Applicant(s)

ENDOH, TOMOAKI

Examiner

Benjamin O. Dulaney

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4, 8, 12-23, 27, 31-38, 40 and 42-44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7, 9-11, 24-26, 28-30, 39 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/8/2006.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 3/14/2006, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-17, 20-26, 28-30, and 32-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), claims 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), and claims 37-44 under claims 35 U.S.C. 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

Examiner acknowledges that claims 5-7, 9-11, 24-26, 28-30, 39 and 41 have been amended to include the previously cited allowable subject matter of claims 8, 12, 27, and 31. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 1) Claims 5-7, 9-11, 24-26, 28-30, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,987,228 by Nishizawa, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,859,832 by Gecht et al.
- 2) Regarding claims 5, 24 and 39, Nishizawa teaches peripheral equipment connected to a network and managed by a directory server on said network (Column 2, lines 31-40), comprising: receiving means for receiving a control command for a job

Art Unit: 2625

from an information processing apparatus on said network (Column 3, lines 2-8; Figure 1); control means for limiting execution of said control command based on decryption results of said first decrypting means (Column 3, lines 2-8); and in the case where said control command is one for deleting a specified job, said control means determines whether or not the job can be deleted based on the decryption results of said first decrypting means and the decryption results of said second decrypting means (Figure 3; Column 4, lines 47-50).

Nishizawa does not teach first decrypting means for decrypting an access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in said control command; second decrypting means for decrypting the access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in the job.

Gecht does teach decrypting means for decrypting an access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in said control command; second decrypting means for decrypting the access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in the job (Column 9, lines 4-8).

Nishizawa and Gecht are combinable because they are both from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nishizawa by Gecht to add encryption/decryption security. The motivation for doing so would have been for security because "it is very desirable to protect any proprietary or confidential information that may be embodied in the print jobs" (Column 9, lines 1-3). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Nishizawa with Gecht to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 24.

Art Unit: 2625

First and second decrypting means were not specified as separate and can therefore be the same means for decrypting.

3) Regarding claims 6 and 25, Nishizawa further teaches the peripheral equipment according to claim 5, wherein said control means does not execute said control command in the case where it is determined by said first decrypting means that said access ticket is not valid (Column 2, lines 58-59).

4) Regarding claims 7 and 26, Nishizawa does not teach the peripheral equipment according to claim 5, wherein, in the case where said control command is one for displaying a list of jobs, said control means changes a display form of the list based on the decryption results of said first decrypting means.

Gecht does teach the peripheral equipment according to claim 5, wherein, in the case where said control command is one for displaying a list of jobs, said control means changes a display form of the list based on the decryption results of said first decrypting means (Column 10, lines 50-55).

Nishizawa and Gecht are combinable because they are both from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nishizawa by Gecht to add a list of jobs personalized to the identified user. The motivation for doing so would have been for security because "it is very desirable to protect any proprietary or confidential information that may be embodied in the print jobs" (Column 9, lines 1-3). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Nishizawa with Gecht to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 and 26.

Art Unit: 2625

5) Regarding claims 9, 28 and 41, Nishizawa teaches peripheral equipment connected to a network and managed by a directory server on said network (Column 2, lines 30-32), comprising: obtaining means for logging in to said directory server based on information inputted from an operation panel and obtaining an access ticket of said peripheral equipment corresponding to the inputted information from said directory server (Column 2, lines 40-46); inputting means for, after obtaining said access ticket, inputting a control command for the Job from said operation panel (Column 2, lines 40-46); and control means for limiting execution of said control command based on decryption results of said first decrypting means (Column 3, lines 2-8); and in the case where said control command is one for deleting a specified job, said control means determines whether or not the job can be deleted based on the decryption results of said first decrypting means and the decryption results of said second decrypting means (Figure 3; Column 4, lines 47-50).

Nishizawa does not teach first decrypting means for decrypting said access ticket; and second decrypting means for decrypting the access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in the job.

Gecht does teach first decrypting means for decrypting said access ticket; and second decrypting means for decrypting the access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in the job (Column 9, lines 4-8).

Nishizawa and Gecht are combinable because they are both from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nishizawa by Gecht to add encryption/decryption security. The motivation for doing so would have been for security because "it is very desirable to protect any proprietary or confidential information that may be embodied in the print jobs" (Column 9, lines 1-3). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Nishizawa with Gecht to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9 and 28.

6) Regarding claims 10 and 29, Nishizawa further teaches the peripheral equipment according to claim 9, wherein said control means does not execute said control command in the case where it is determined by said first decrypting means that said access ticket is not valid (Column 2, 58-59).

7) Regarding claims 11 and 30, Nishizawa does not teach the peripheral equipment according to claim 9, wherein, in the case where said control command is one for displaying a list of jobs, said control means changes a display form of the list based on the decryption results of said first decrypting means.

Gecht does teach the peripheral equipment according to claim 9, wherein, in the case where said control command is one for displaying a list of jobs, said control means changes a display form of the list based on the decryption results of said first decrypting means (Column 10, lines 50-55).

Nishizawa and Gecht are combinable because they are both from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nishizawa by Gecht to add a list of jobs personalized to

Art Unit: 2625

the identified user. The motivation for doing so would have been for security because "it is very desirable to protect any proprietary or confidential information that may be embodied in the print jobs" (Column 9, lines 1-3). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Nishizawa with Gecht to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11 and 30.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin O. Dulaney whose telephone number is (571) 272-2874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (9am - 6pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Lamb can be reached on (571)272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin O. Dulaney

Twyler M. Lamb
Twyler M. Lamb
Supervisory Patent Examiner